

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-21 and 51-77 are in the application.

Claims 22-50 have been withdrawn.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-21 and 51-77 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jalili (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,683) in view of Rogers (U.S. Patent No. 7,136,475). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner notes that Jalili does not teach receiving a telephone call over the telephone network that seeks to initiate a transaction with a target. Furthermore, the Examiner notes that Jalili does not teach the caller ID comprising ESN, MIN or MEID. The Examiner states that Roger teaches a method for call management (column 1, line 60 through column 2, line 48) that comprises receiving a telephone call over the telephone network that seeks to initiate a transaction with a target.

As described on page 8 of Applicant's Specification, a transaction "may include, for example, the ordering of merchandise from a merchant; the payment of a bill to a merchant, a utility, etc.; the transfer of money to another person or merchant; the transfer of money from one account to another; or the transfer of assets or property from one entity to another, such as by transferring ownership of shares, etc., among other types of transactions."

In distinction, Rogers does not mention the word "transaction." Instead Rogers is directed to management of incoming telephone calls by performing such operations as answering a call, transferring a call to another destination, initiating a conference call, etc. (Column 12, line 33 through Column 14, line 20). These telephone operations are

not transactions as defined by Applicant's Specification. Thus, Rogers does not teach the element of "receiving a telephone call over the telephone network that seeks to initiate a transaction with a target ."

Jalili and Rogers, taken either singly or in combination, do not teach the element of "receiving a telephone call over the telephone network that seeks to initiate a transaction with a target ." As such, Jalili and Rogers are legally precluded from rendering the claims as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/Duane H. Dreger/  
Duane H. Dreger  
Reg. No. 48,836  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-2500